



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

gated in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and then incorporated in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. The defeat of the Bard amendment gave strong emphasis to the policy of the Government with respect to the equality of the citizens and subjects of all nations in the use of the canal.

While the treaty was in the Senate one of the considerations urged in favor of the equality of all nations, including the United States, in its traffic provisions, was that there would then be no ground for friction with respect to the use of the canal, and that all nations would alike be interested in preserving it against attack; that such a policy would in effect practically take the canal out of the zone of international contention. This consideration found favor in the minds of many.

ARBITRATION.

I do not believe that we should put Great Britain to the trouble of resorting to an arbitral tribunal to determine a question which has no basis either in fact or good conscience. The question is one which from every consideration of national good faith and national honor should be settled by ourselves, and if we rightly understand it, there need be no doubt that it will be settled in entire harmony with our manifest national duty. In the event, however, that we are unable to accept the view that we are not entitled to preferential treatment, then we owe it to ourselves and to Great Britain and other nations to submit the question to the determination of an impartial tribunal. This course is laid upon us by the highest considerations of justice and fair dealing toward other powers. The American people will keep faith; they will not for the first time break their international word, and thereby forfeit the high respect in which they are held by the nations of the world.

Disarmament a Moral Issue.

By Philip Van Ness Myers.

A paper read at the St. Louis Peace Congress May 2, 1913.

The only word which I shall venture to contribute to this symposium on disarmament is a word as to the way in which the teacher can best aid this great cause.

We must note, first, that the condition precedent of the final and complete triumph of this movement is the creation of a new conscience in regard to the entire war system as an internationally recognized and legalized institution of modern civilization; for, believe me, it is the new conscience, and not the new dreadnought, that is going to abolish war and keep it abolished. Men will never stop fighting merely because fighting is costly and dangerous. History affords sufficient evidence of this. Men will stop fighting only when they can no longer fight with a good conscience. Hence the awakening of this new conscience in the young must be the aim of the teacher who would help make real the prophetic vision of the nations dwelling together in peace and unity in a disarmed world.

Now, every science related directly or indirectly to man, interpreted with insight and breadth of view, becomes an effective means of awakening true moral feelings and judgments respecting war and the ruinous expenditures of the nations on the implements of war.

Biology has already made valuable contributions to this campaign of moral education. I need merely refer to the great biological argument against war as embodied in that notable work entitled "The Human Harvest," by President Jordan. That little book, showing how the destruction in war of the flower of the young manhood of the nations generation after generation results, through the inevitable workings of biological laws, in such a degeneracy of the human stock as imperils the very existence of modern civilization, has created in thousands new feelings and a new conscience, not merely as to the irrationality, but as to the criminality, of war between civilized nations.

Likewise should the ethical element in economics be stressed. The economic argument against war should be turned into a moral argument, and its force thereby enhanced many fold. This can be done, because all economic questions are at bottom moral questions. The expenditure yearly by the nations on their competitive war armaments of sums counted by thousands of millions must be shown to be something which concerns not the economist alone, but the moralist as well. Conscience is deeply involved in this thing. An eminent worker in the peace cause has put it all in a phrase. He has said, "I should like to add an eleventh command to the Ten Commandments, and it would be this: 'Thou shalt not waste thy substance.'" This waste of communal resources on war armaments, whereby every social, intellectual, and moral interest of society suffers from lack of adequate support, is *the* national sin of this age.

But of all the sciences none can be made, through presentation from the moral point of view, more directly contributory to the creation of a new conscience respecting the essential wickedness of war than the science of history. This is so because of the moral content of history. History has been defined as applied psychology. We make the definition narrower and maintain that history is applied conscience. Conscience is the great history maker. The great issues of history, like this issue of disarmament, are moral issues. The great reforms and revolutions of history are moral in their deepest causes as well as in their most important and enduring effects. They result ever from a divergence between what *is* and what *ought to be*. And because this is so—because the essence of true history is the record of the moral life of man, is the story of the conflict of good and evil within the human soul and its awakening through the travail of the ages to a clearer "vision of the divine;"—because this is so, this great drama of humanity, like the drama of the stage, as conceived by the greatest of Greek philosophers, has a cleansing and clarifying effect upon the moral sense.

The limitations of time under which we speak forbid our offering any proofs or illustrations of this one thesis, that history envisioned and interpreted, not in terms of politics, as has been our wont hitherto, but in terms of ethics, in terms of the unfolding moral consciousness of man, may be made a powerful means of creating in the young a conscience uncompromisingly intolerant of war and of these insane, suicidal expenditures of the nations on all the infernal enginery of war.

I offer merely my personal confession of faith—a faith created and confirmed by the evidences of an unfolding and increasing moral purpose in the historic

evolution: I believe that through an ethical necessity the day of the universal disarmament of the nations approaches; that there dawns a better age, the men of which will look with the same incredulous amazement upon our engines and devices for wholesale man-killing that we of this age look upon the Iron Virgin of Nuremberg and the other infernal mediæval instruments of torture in the museums of Europe.

In view of the wars and rumors of wars that fill the earth at this very hour; in view of the fact that preparations for war were never so vast and costly as they are today; in view of these things, does our optimistic forecast of the speedy disarmament of the nations seem to you oversanguine and incredible? If so, we are persuaded that this is because you have failed to note what is really the most significant thing in the spectacle presented by the international world today. The most significant thing in the ongoings of life at Rome on that memorable day of the year 404 of our era which saw the last gladiatorial combat in the colosseum was not that, four hundred years after the incoming of Christianity, with its teachings of the sanctity of human life, gladiators fought on the arena to make a holiday for Rome; the significant thing was that protest made by the Christian monk Telemachus and sealed by his martyr death, for that announced the birth into the Roman world of a new conscience, and that, through an ethical necessity, meant the speedy abolition of "the human sacrifices of the amphitheater."

And so today the significant thing in the international situation that confronts us is not that nineteen hundred years after the advent of a religion of peace and goodwill among men the earth is still the arena of bloody fratricidal war, and resounds with the din of stupendous preparations for war; the significant thing is the constantly growing protest against it all, for that announces the birth into this modern world of a new international conscience, and that, through an ethical necessity like that which abolished forever the bloody sacrifices of the colosseum, means, at a time not remote as history reckons time, the disarmament of the nations, the beating of their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks, and the abolition of war as a crass negation of human solidarity and kinship and a venturesome denial of a moral order of the world and the sovereignty of conscience.

The Peace Palace and William Penn.*

The Palace of Peace at The Hague is to be dedicated next August with elaborate ceremonies, in which representatives from all the world will participate. The Second Hague Conference voted unanimously, and on motion made by Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, "that each government represented at The Hague should contribute to the erection of the Peace Palace by sending, after consultation with the architect, materials of construction and ornamentation, representing the purest example of its national production, so that this palace, an expression of universal goodwill and hope, may be built of the very substance of all countries." This vote has been acted upon by many of the

governments, and the Congress of the United States has recently appropriated the sum of twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000.00) for statuary to be erected in the palace as the gift of the United States.

A generous citizen of Pennsylvania, Andrew Carnegie, presented the sum of one million and a quarter dollars for the erection of the building, which is to be devoted primarily to the sessions of the International Court of Arbitration created by the First Hague Conference in 1899. It is a fact well known to Pennsylvanians that another great Pennsylvanian, William Penn, the founder of our Commonwealth and the greatest American of Colonial times, published in 1693, two centuries before the conference and the court of The Hague, his so-called "Plan for the Peace of Europe." In this plan he proposed the establishment of a "Sovereign or Imperial Dyet, Parliament, or State of Europe, before which Sovereign Assembly should be brought all Differences depending between one Sovereign and another." This plan for the federation and peace of Europe is doubly interesting to us Pennsylvanians, and is noteworthy as the first detailed plan for an international court of justice which was proposed by a responsible statesman and inspired purely by the love of humanity and not by any ulterior motive.

In view of the above facts, it would seem most appropriate for the citizens of Pennsylvania to present as a gift to the Peace Palace a statue or other memorial of William Penn, the founder of their Commonwealth and the prophet of the Hague Conference and Tribunal.

The Peace Society of the Netherlands has just offered to present to the palace a bust of Hugo Grotius, their fellow-Hollander and the founder of international law. This offer has been gratefully accepted by the committee in charge of the palace, and a Dutch sculptress, Miss Ewa van Dantzig, who is an artist of great talent, has been secured for the making of the bust. The world recognizes this is a most appropriate gift from the Peace Society of Holland; and it is believed that a statue of William Penn presented in the name of Pennsylvania's seven and a half million inhabitants—who outnumber the citizens of the Netherlands by one and a half millions—would be greeted by an equal share of the world's interest and gratitude.

In a paper on "The Hague Tribunal," which was read at a recent meeting of the Fourth National Peace Congress held in St. Louis, I ventured to make the following suggestion:

"During the summer of 1913 there is to be dedicated at The Hague that strong and beautiful Palace of Peace which is to shelter within its walls the youthful beginnings of the world-republic. To that palace the nations of the world, our own included, have contributed of their substance, their materials of construction and ornamentation, and thus have made it an embodiment of the international goodwill and the organization of international law and justice which have illumined the dawn of the twentieth century. There is no nobler, no more fitting gift which our Republic can bestow upon this palace than an international supreme court; and, as a visible expression of its spirit and aims, there might well be erected within its courtroom a statue of William Penn, that first American who prophesied and advocated it for the nations, and

* This letter appeared in the Philadelphia *Public Ledger* May 11, 1913.